

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed Sept. 12, 2005. Claims 1-34 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-34. The present Response amends claims 1, 2, 13, 23, 33-34, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration of claims 1-34. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

I. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Regarding claims 1-2, 13, 23, and 33-34, the phrase “can” or “can be” renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention.

Claims 1-2, 13, 23, and 33-34 to eliminate the phrase “can” or “can be”, and the Applicant respectfully request the rejection with respect to these claims and their dependent claims be withdrawn.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang (Pub. No. 2004/0143815 A1) in view of Beauchamp et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,621,505 B1).

Prima facie obviousness rejection requires the Examiner to show that the prior art alone or in combination teaches or suggests all elements of the claimed invention. The present invention keeps in memory only a subset of the stream of events **before** performing a match on these events (claim 1, 13, 23, 33, and 34). In contrast, Wang keeps in memory matched events **after** performing a match on the entire stream of events – “All the matched nodes are collected and pushed to the stack ...” (paragraph 0043, line 19-20, Figure 3, 20->24->34->36). This distinction is critical since by keeping portion of the stream of the events in memory before matching, the present invention allows matching to be performed:

- only on a subset of the stream of events vs. the entire stream of events as in Wang, which is time-consuming.

- multiple times on the subset of the events stored in memory vs. only once as in Wang where the unmatched events are not stored.

On the other hand, Beauchamp is a data presentation method at the upstream of the data processing method of the present invention as discussed in the previous response on 5/4/2005. Therefore, Wang in view of Beauchamp cannot render the present invention in independent claims 1, 13, 23, 33, and 34 obvious. Since claims 2-12 depend on claim 1, claims 14-22 depend on claim 13, claims 24-32 depend on claim 23, Wang in view of Beauchamp cannot render claims 1-34 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for at least this reason, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection with respect to these claims be withdrawn.


II. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/20/05

By: 
David T. Xue
Reg. No. 54,554

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer No. 23910